

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
8 AT SEATTLE

9 KING ELECTRICAL  
10 MANUFACTURING CO.,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 UNIVERSAL LOGISTICS HOLDINGS,  
14 INC.,

15 Defendant.

Case No. C19-0725RSL

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

16 This matter comes before the Court *sua sponte*. On May 15, 2019, defendant  
17 removed the above-captioned matter to federal court alleging that the Court has  
18 jurisdiction based on the diversity of citizenship of the parties. See 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a)  
19 (establishing that the federal court’s basic diversity jurisdiction extends to “all civil  
20 actions where the matter in controversy exceeds . . . \$75,000 . . . and is between . . .  
21 citizens of different States.”). “For a case to qualify for federal jurisdiction under 28  
22 U.S.C. § 1332(a), there must be complete diversity of citizenship between the parties  
23 opposed in interest.” Kuntz v. Lamar Corp., 385 F.3d 1177, 1181 (9th Cir. 2004)  
24 (internal citation omitted). In examining whether complete diversity is present, the  
25 citizenship of a limited liability company is determined by examining the citizenship of

1 the owners/members. See Johnson v. Columbia Props. Anchorage, LP, 437 F.3d 894, 899  
2 (9th Cir. 2006) (holding that “like a partnership, an LLC is a citizen of every state of  
3 which its owners/members are citizens”).

4 Defendant, relying on the allegations of the complaint, asserts that plaintiff King  
5 Electrical Manufacturing Co. is a limited liability company, but fails to provide the  
6 necessary citizenship information. Defendant has therefore failed to meet its burden of  
7 establishing the basis of the Court’s jurisdiction. See Indus. Tectonics, Inc. v. Aero Alloy,  
8 912 F.2d 1090, 1092 (9th Cir. 1990) (“The party asserting jurisdiction has the burden of  
9 proving all jurisdictional facts”); Fed R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3) (“If the Court determines at any  
10 time that it lacks subject-matter jurisdiction, the court must dismiss the action”). As a  
11 result, defendant is ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE by May 31, 2019, why the Court  
12 should not remand this action to state court by providing the Court with the citizenship of  
13 all of the owners/members of the plaintiff LLC at the time the complaint was filed.

14  
15 The Clerk of the Court is directed to place this order to show cause on the Court’s  
16 calendar for May 31, 2019.

17 Dated this 21st day of May, 2019.

18  
19 

20 \_\_\_\_\_  
21 Robert S. Lasnik  
22 United States District Judge  
23  
24  
25